

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 79

April 2, 1998, 8:26 pm
Page S-3083 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/ESA Landowner Incentive Program Funding

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1999-2003 . . . S.Con. Res. 86. Kempthorne perfecting amendment No. 2285 to the Reid amendment No. 2206.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 55-43

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S.Con. Res. 86, the Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1999-2003, will balance the unified budget in 1998 and will run surpluses for each of the next 5 fiscal years. Both Federal spending and Federal revenues will increase 3.5 percent from fiscal year (FY) 1998 to FY 1999. All surpluses will be reserved for Social Security reform. A reserve fund will be established to allow the entire Federal share of revenues resulting from a potential tobacco settlement to be dedicated to bolstering Medicare's solvency.

The Reid amendment would express the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that the landowner incentive program included in the Endangered Species Recovery Act should be financed from a dedicated source of funding and that public lands should not be sold to fund the landowner incentive program of the Endangered Species Recovery Act.

The Kempthorne perfecting amendment to the Reid amendment changes amendment to express the sense of the Senate that the landowner incentive program included in the Endangered Species Recovery Act should be financed from a dedicated source of funding, and that public lands should not be sold to fund the landowner incentive program of the Endangered Species Recovery Act through their proceeds alone, if subsequent legislation provides an alternative or mixed, dedicated source of mandatory spending.

The amendments were considered after all debate time had expired. However, by unanimous consent, 2 minutes of debate were permitted on each amendment.

NOTE: After the vote, the underlying amendment, as amended, was adopted by voice vote.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

(See other side)								
YEAS (55)			NAYS (43)			NOT VOTING (2)		
Republicans (53 or 98%)		Democrats (2 or 5%)	Republicans (1 or 2%)		Democrats (42 or 95%)	Republicans (1)		Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Bingaman	Gregg	Akaka	Kennedy	Helms- ^{2AY}		Inouye- ²
Allard	Inhofe	Cleland		Baucus	Kerrey			
Ashcroft	Jeffords			Biden	Kerry			
Bennett	Kempthorne			Boxer	Kohl			
Bond	Kyl			Breaux	Landrieu			
Brownback	Lott			Bryan	Lautenberg			
Burns	Lugar			Bumpers	Leahy			
Campbell	Mack			Byrd	Levin			
Chafee	McCain			Conrad	Lieberman			
Coats	McConnell			Daschle	Mikulski			
Cochran	Murkowski			Dodd	Moseley-Braun			
Collins	Nickles			Dorgan	Moynihan			
Coverdell	Roberts			Durbin	Murray			
Craig	Roth			Feingold	Reed			
D'Amato	Santorum			Feinstein	Reid			
DeWine	Sessions			Ford	Robb			
Domenici	Shelby			Glenn	Rockefeller			
Enzi	Smith, Bob			Graham	Sarbanes			
Faircloth	Smith, Gordon			Harkin	Torricelli			
Frist	Snowe			Hollings	Wellstone			
Gorton	Specter			Johnson	Wyden			
Gramm	Stevens							
Grams	Thomas							
Grassley	Thompson							
Hagel	Thurmond							
Hatch	Warner							
Hutchinson								

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Our colleagues object to the proposal to use funds from Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land sales for the landowner incentive program of the Endangered Species Recovery Act. We do not. Those sales are going to take place in any event, and we need a revenue source for the landowner incentive program. That program is intended to get landowners to agree to habitat reserve agreements, safe harbor agreements, habitat conservation plans, recovery plans, and similar agreements and plans to save endangered species, more than half of which are found primarily on private lands. Private landowners suffer significant economic hardships in efforts to save endangered species and they should be compensated. We are not committed to using funds from BLM land sales in perpetuity--we are just committed to using funds, and those are the funds that are available at present. We will happily consider any funding streams our colleagues propose. We are not foreclosing options. The underlying resolution may have given our colleagues the mistaken impression that BLM land sales were intended as the permanent funding solution for the landowner incentive program. To correct that impression, we have offered the Kempthorne amendment to add to the Reid amendment rather than to simply substitute for its language. The Kempthorne amendment would make clear that BLM land-sale funds, or other funds, could be used. We certainly favor finding a dedicated, permanent funding source, but until that time we do not think landowners should go uncompensated. Therefore, we urge acceptance of the Kempthorne amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The costs of the landowner incentive program are ongoing--the proceeds from land sales involve one-time benefits. If the plan in this resolution to use BLM land sales to pay for the landowner incentive program is allowed to go forward, BLM land will have to be sold year after year, in perpetuity. We strongly oppose selling off Federal assets in this manner. A permanent funding source should be found instead. In the meantime, alternative methods of compensation can be used. For instance, one method that is currently favored by the BLM is land exchanges. It offers land to private property owners that they find more desirable in exchange for the land with endangered species on it. This proposal does not involve recurring costs, year after year--in fact, it does not involve any costs. We acknowledge that our colleagues have attempted to reach a compromise with the Kempthorne amendment, but this amendment would still allow the sale of public lands to fund a program that has recurring costs. The Senate should not budget in that fashion. Therefore, we urge the rejection of the Kempthorne amendment.